

Comments Received on the New Surface Storage TM and Responses

#	Page	Line	Comment	Comment Category ^a	Response (if necessary)
1	2.13	308	Federal Land Policy and Management Act, Executive Order 11990 and Wild and Scenic Rivers Act need to be added to the list	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
2		Entire document	The study shows excess spring runoff calculations. We need a hydrograph of the creeks and rivers to show what the flow is outside of the excess spring runoff.	2	An example hydrograph for Conant Creek is provided in Exhibit 2-2, and the approach to determining the quantity of excess spring runoff is illustrated. For each storage site, the quantity of water potentially available for storage (excess spring runoff) was then calculated following that approach and listed in a table in each section (e.g., Exhibit 3-3 for Lane Lake). A more detailed examination of hydrology will be conducted during future phases of the study.
3		Entire document	Are there going to be Hvdros associated with these proposals, if so, where are they located?	2	Hydroelectric facilities may be an element of the storage projects. At this time, the hydropower evaluation focused on generation potential based on expected head and flow and following a generalized set of assumptions. Hydroelectric facilities will be further examined during future phases of the study.
4	Exhibit 3-12, 4-12, 5-12, 7-13	Recreation/Economic Value	There are outfitters licensed by the State of Idaho, permitted by the BLM for the Teton River and permitted by the Forest Service for the Henrys Fork. There are also numerous recreation opportunities related to the rivers and creeks that are identified as potentially available for storage. Disagree with the low ratings.	2	The current recreation/economic value ratings are based on the proposed reservoir sites. Potential impacts to stream segments/points of diversion and discharge will be further examined during future phases of the study.
5	Exhibit 6-10		Badger Creek is eligible for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
6		Entire document	It is hard to understand the canal locations, points of diversion, etc.	2	A figure in each section (e.g., Exhibit 3-4 for Lane Lake) shows a conceptual schematic of the potential points of diversion and canal/pipeline routes. Drawings will be further refined and detail added during future phases of the study.
7	2-4	58	Inadequate analysis to even comment on proposed water storage volume.	2	Hydrologic analysis approach is documented and is consistent with other studies at this planning level. A more detailed examination of hydrology will be conducted during future phases of the study.
8	2-4	61-62	Amount of uncertainty is too high for water budget calculations to be made, where's the real data?	2	See response to comment 7.
9	2-4	65-70	Gross inadequate amount of assumptions made to even comment on proposed available water for storage	2	See response to comment 7.
10	2-8	134	How can an analysis be considered as an option when hydropower benefits are not known?	2	See response to comment 3.
11	2-8	135-139	Who has deemed the hydropower potential assumptions valid for all locations? Based on what?	2	See response to comment 3.
12	2-8	145-147	How can the cost of a project even begin to be estimated when so many design and site specific criteria have been left out of the equation? Comparisons between different sites while excluding a gross amount of information cannot and should not be made, yet they are done so in this document.	2	Cost estimating approach is documented and is consistent with other studies at this planning level (intended for preliminary screening only). A more detailed examination of cost will be conducted during future phases of the study.
13	2-8	148-161	Omitted from this section is the impact on private land owners, property values, and the individual cost to surrounding land owners. How will the Bureau address these negative impacts? No mention of this, gross oversight.	2	Such impacts would likely be addressed through land acquisition, but those costs are specifically excluded at this stage of the study (P. 2-8, Line 154). A more detailed examination of cost, including land acquisition, will be conducted during future phases of the study.
14	2-8	164	Hydropower- no cost analysis provided, inadequate information.	2	The cost basis for hydropower facilities is explained in Section 2.3.4.11. The line in question notes that hydropower benefits were not included in the analysis at this time. See response to comment 3.
15	2-9	167	Recreation- existing recreation opportunities exist within the basin, where's the need and what is the basis?	2	Recreation impacts are categorized (see Section 2.6 for approach and Exhibit 3-12 for a Lane Lake example), but the line in question indicates that recreation benefits were not included in the analysis at this time. Recreation benefits may be examined in further detail during future

Comments Received on the New Surface Storage TM and Responses

#	Page	Line	Comment	Comment Category ^a	Response (if necessary)
					phases of the study.
16	2-9	168	Supplemental fish flows- no mention or reference to any study linking a lack of water to fish survival, no geomorphic survey data presented or taken into account to determine whether or not additional flows can be conveyed by existing stream/river channel type/geometries.	2	Beyond the scope of this level of study; only mentioned as a potential benefit whose economic impact has not been quantified.
17	2-9	169	Overwintering reservoir habitat- none exists now, not needed, where/what is the basis for this need?	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
18	2-9	170	Flood control- flood control is needed based on which studies? None provided, again, inadequate provided.	2	See response to comment 16.
19	2-9	188-189	Potential available water above baseflow is a gross over estimate since most surface water in the state of Idaho has already been appropriated. Gross over estimate.	2	See response to comment 7.
20	2-9	206	"Water balance considerations were not evaluated at this stage..." how can a proposal for a dam be made which is based on water availability if it is not known how much water will be available for the proposed impoundment/hydropower??? Grossly inadequate to be used as a determinate for site eligibility. Again, inadequate information.	2	See response to comment 7.
21	2-13	298	"All water rights..." How will impoundment of surface water not affect existing surface water rights? No explanation, inadequate information.	2	Water sent to new surface storage sites would be junior to existing water rights, hence the reason for extracting flows during excess spring runoff.
22	2-14	336	"New consumptive use water rights..." Where will the existing consumptive use come from (which water rights) to offset new evaporation from the proposed dam? Consumptive use analysis? Inadequate information.	2	Statement in question only indicates that new consumptive rights must come from available water and not be detrimental to existing rights.
23	2-15	394-396	"Legal water available is not known..." Again, how can a proposal for a dam be made which is based on water availability if it is not known how much water will even be available for the proposed impoundment/hydropower??? Grossly inadequate information to be used as a determinate for site eligibility. Again, inadequate information.	2	See response to comment 7.
24	2-16	404	"No field reconnaissance..." How can a proposal for a dam be set forth with no investigation into the geology of the site specific area? Looks like someone put a dot on a map and thought the upper Moose Creek watershed would be a good place, nevermind not knowing if the geology supports this type of structure. Grossly inadequate information.	2	Geologic assessment was limited to a preliminary desktop exercise at this time. A more detailed geologic field investigation will be conducted during future phases of the study.
25	7-29	367	"Water for the reservoir must be pumped from the Henrys Fork River..." Is the cost to pump the water to the reservoir greater than the cost benefit from the hydropower from the dam? No specs on pumping plant, inadequate information.	2	Hydropower benefits are not currently considered; see response to comment 3. Also, this is a summary section.
26	7-29	393	Where are the "unmet irrigation demands" documented? How much/when/where/etc, 60,000AF? Grossly inadequate information provided to justify need of new impoundment dam.	2	Unmet irrigation demands are documented in the Henrys Fork Watershed Basin Study Needs Assessment (http://www.usbr.gov/pn/programs/studies/idaho/henrysfork/techrept/index.html). The potential storage site volume is based on topography at the proposed dam site, and water delivery follows the hydrology approach described in Section 2.2.1.
27	7-34	446	How can dam configuration and makeup be identified when the geology of the site is not known? Inadequate information once again.	2	The dam configuration was identified following the approach outlined in Section 2.2.3. Also see response to comment 24.
28	7-38	480	Diversion and storage of 60,000AF negatively impacts all water right holders dependent upon those flows to fill downstream reservoirs. Negative impact given no consideration.	2	See response to comment 21.
29	Exhibit 7-		Presence of YCT- source? Table leaves out Grizzly Bear critical habitat. How will pumping water from the headwaters of the Henrys Fork River impact aquatic, avian	2	YCT source is noted as IDFG. Impacts to other species are noted in Exhibit 7-12.

Comments Received on the New Surface Storage TM and Responses

#	Page	Line	Comment	Comment Category ^a	Response (if necessary)
	11		and other wildlife? Not addressed, inadequate information.		
30	Exhibit 7-12		Absence of Grizzly Bear critical habitat, inadequate information.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
31	Exhibit 7-13		Very low recreational/economic value, lacking infrastructure to accommodate proposed dam, inadequate site.	2	Recreation/economic value rating deals with existing value and use of the reservoir site, not potential value added. A moderate rating was assigned because of the presence of an existing archaeological site.
32	Exhibit 7-14		“Environmental Considerations- neutral” According to input from basin stakeholders, who are the stakeholders and who do they represent? I can think of 100 considerations that would list this project as NEGATIVE.	1	Stakeholder input from Workgroup meetings and personal communications is reflected in Exhibits 7-11, 7-12, 7-13. Updated table to reflect negative environmental considerations.
33			Concerns not addressed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grizzly bear habitat- affect on species from Moose Creek Dam Earthquake potential- historic proximity and magnitude of earthquakes near the proposed dam site, how would proposed dam deal with this hazard? Private land owners property depreciation Private land owners, towns and communities flood protection from potential dam failure Cost associated with increase in populous traffic in and out of proposed dam site, including maintenance to roads and facilities 	1/2	Grizzly bear habitat comment addressed in final TM. All other comments are beyond the scope of this level of study, but may be addressed during future phases.
34	8	12	Lane Lake damsite is not in Teton Basin. It is north of Teton Canyon, and in Teton watershed, but not what is considered Teton Basin.	1	Unfamiliar with local definition of Teton Basin. In this case, reference was only intended to differentiate between locations in Teton vs. Henrys Fork watersheds. Will replace basin with watershed in final TM.
35	8	19	Spring Creek damsite is not in Teton Basin, it is in the Big Hole Mountains.	1	Comment addressed in final TM. See response to comment 34.
36	8	26	Moody damsite is not in Teton Basin, it is in the Big Hole Mountains.	1	Comment addressed in final TM. See response to comment 34.
37	29	6	Lane Lake not in Teton Basin	1	Comment addressed in final TM. See response to comment 34.
38	40		At Risk Species – add sharp-tailed grouse, bald eagle, sandhill crane	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
39	44	183	Spring Creek not in Teton Basin	1	Comment addressed in final TM. See response to comment 34.
40	44	206	Confusing – how will Spring Creek supply water to Teton Basin?	1	Comment addressed in final TM. See response to comment 34.
41	55		Spring Creek is both large game winter range and a migration corridor. At Risk species – add sharp-tailed grouse, sandhill crane, T&E add grizzly bear	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
42	56		Land Recreation – there is a moderate amount of hunting that occurs at this site, also ATV trails.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
43	59	6	Moody Creek not in Teton Basin	1	Comment addressed in final TM. See response to comment 34.
44	67	133	Moody Creek is big game winter range	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
45	69		Large game winter range, at risk species – add sharp-tailed grouse, sandhill crane, T&E perhaps add grizzly bear	1	Comment addressed in final TM. Assuming grizzly bear not present since not present at Spring Creek.
46	83		At Risk species – add sharp-tailed grouse, sandhill crane	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
47	98	513	Moose Creek is a large game migration corridor.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
48	98	516	T&E species include core grizzly bear habitat, also wolverine, lynx, and several sensitive species	1	Comment addressed in final TM.

Comments Received on the New Surface Storage TM and Responses

#	Page	Line	Comment	Comment Category ^a	Response (if necessary)
49	99		Is a large game migration corridor. At Risk species – add boreal owl, flammulated owl, perhaps northern three-toed woodpecker. T&E add grizzly bear, lynx, wolverine	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
50	100		Moose Creek has high recreational value for hunting, hiking, camping, wildlife viewing, etc. Moose Creek is within 3 miles of Yellowstone National Park. This area has high scenic value.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
51	1-2	39	Increased storage above Island Park Reservoir would decrease winter flow releases below Island Park Dam impacting young of the year trout survival and the blue ribbon trout fishery in Box Canyon and the Ranch.	2	Comment acknowledged, but no change required.
52	2-8	139	The ecological impacts of hydropower generation were also not considered in this study. For hydropower generation to be most economical it would need to be ran year round which depending on the alternative may lead to dewatering of certain stream reaches during base flow periods.	2	Correct, the ecological impact assessment was generally limited to the reservoir footprint. A more detailed impacts assessment will be conducted during future phases of the study. Also see response to comment 3.
53	2-9	169	Recommend deleting “supplemental fish flows” (ecological stream flow needs) as a benefit. While there may be little doubt that increased flows in certain areas as a result of the proposed projects may benefit local fish. This is a rob Peter to pay Paul approach where Peter is most likely a native cutthroat and Paul a non-native rainbow. Resulting in a net loss for native fish.	2	See response to comment 16.
54	2-9	196	Were canals sized to move the 30 day peak flows?	2	Yes, the design inflow approach described in Section 2.3.4.1 was used to size canals and pipes.
55	2-13	308	Add - Wild and Scenic Rivers Act 1968 (16 USC 1271-1287)	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
56	2-13	340	Please explain why alternatives are being considered such as Moose Creek which are not consistent with State Water Plans and are in direct conflict with the listed prohibitions.	2	The Reconnaissance Evaluation is a high level planning effort looking at developing water supplies in the Henrys Fork Basin. Surface storage was considered at locations where topography allowed. The intent of the referenced policy section was to acknowledge existing constraints. It may be feasible or necessary at a future time to modify such prohibitions before water supply projects could be developed.
57	3-1	31	Recommend deleting ecological stream flow needs as a benefit. While there may be little doubt that increased flows in certain areas as a result of the proposed projects may benefit local fish. This is a rob Peter to pay Paul approach where Peter is most likely a native cutthroat and Paul a non-native rainbow. Resulting in a net loss for native fish. (this is repeated in many areas of the document)	2	The referenced statement simply acknowledges stream flow segments that may experience improved connectivity, depending on operations of the storage site. No change is required.
58	3-11	119	Recommend deleting ecological stream flow needs as a benefit. While there may be little doubt that increased flows in certain areas as a result of the proposed projects may benefit local fish. This is a rob Peter to pay Paul approach where Peter is most likely a native cutthroat and Paul a non-native rainbow. Resulting in a net loss for native fish.	2	See response to comment 57.
59	3-11	120	Proposed changes under the LL-B alternative would in essence create a spring creek like system below the Bitch Creek diversion by removing peak flood flows to fill the reservoir. This would decrease the competitive advantage that Yellowstone cutthroat currently have and result in a rainbow trout dominated system in what is now considered a core population of Yellowstone cutthroat. Hybridization or introgression of rainbows with river dwelling fluvial cutthroat would increase. This would also increase the risk of introgression to resident cutthroat within the Jedediah Smith Wilderness.	2	Comment acknowledged, but no change required. Potential impacts to the YCT population in Bitch Creek are noted, and a more detailed environmental assessment will be conducted during future phases of the study.
60	4-16	178	This alternative seems unfeasible in comparison to some of the others given cost, storage volume and potential water sources. Any diversions from Bitch Creek raise similar concerns as expressed above.	2	Comment acknowledged, but no change required. Screening of alternatives occurs in the Interim Report.

Comments Received on the New Surface Storage TM and Responses

#	Page	Line	Comment	Comment Category ^a	Response (if necessary)
61	4-26	295	Canyon Creek supports a population of river dwelling fluvial cutthroat that uses Canyon Creek for spawning and rearing to support the cutthroat population in Teton River. (Canyon Creek supports more fluvial use than Moody Creek as Canyon Creek has more flow and better connectivity.) There are reports of fluvial cutthroat spawning on Forest lands as high as Blacktail Creek or over 15 miles from Highway 33. There are projects in the works to improve connectivity and flow within Canyon Creek which will only enhance the value of this tributary for fluvial fish.	2	Comment acknowledged, but no change required. Potential impacts to the YCT population in Canyon Creek are noted, and a more detailed environmental assessment will be conducted during future phases of the study.
62	5-9	126	Canyon and Moody Creeks both support populations of river dwelling fluvial cutthroat that use these tributaries for spawning and rearing to support the cutthroat population in Teton River. Canyon Creek supports more fluvial use than Moody Creek as Canyon Creek has more flow and better connectivity. There are reports of fluvial cutthroat spawning on Forest lands as high as Blacktail Creek or over 15 miles from Highway 33. There are projects in the works to improve connectivity and flow within Canyon Creek which will only enhance the value of this tributary for fluvial fish.	2	See response to comment 61.
63	6-23	292	The proposed reservoir could change connectivity in a negative way by watering 3 more miles of a dry section of Badger Creek that has acted as a barrier to rainbow trout invasion.	2	Comment acknowledged, but no change required. Impacts of connectivity not discussed in this section.
64	6-23	298	Enhanced flows below the proposed dam would likely increase the already abundant population of rainbow trout that exist in the lower reach of Badger Creek that is re-watered by spring inflow. This could lead to further hybridization of cutthroat trout in the Teton River and Bitch Creek.	2	See response to comment 63.
65	6-23	302	The reservoir site is not crucial Yellowstone cutthroat habitat (if there is no fluvial cutthroat usage) but provides a dry reach barrier during periods of low flow that has successfully prevented invasion of rainbow trout up stream.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
66	6-23	304	A reservoir would provide a site for potential establishment of rainbow trout or other species that would have a negative impact on the core population of Yellowstone cutthroat in Badger Creek	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
67	7-29	397	Once again the term “ecological flow needs” is misleading. Increased storage above Island Park Reservoir would decrease winter flow releases below Island Park Dam impacting young of the year trout survival and the blue ribbon trout fishery in Box Canyon, the Ranch and Riverside reaches.	2	See response to comment 57.
68	7-38	489	Project would need to comply with the 1997 Revised Targhee Forest Plan. Since this project would not be in compliance it would require an EIS to evaluate amending the Forest Plan.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
69	7-39	511	Exhibit 7-11 update with status of state and federal river designations listed below.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
70	7-40	512	Big Springs is the headwaters of the Henrys Fork and was the first National Water Trail designated in the US in 1981.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
71	7-40	512	Big Springs is also designated as a National Natural Landmark.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.

Comments Received on the New Surface Storage TM and Responses

#	Page	Line	Comment	Comment Category ^a	Response (if necessary)
72	7-40	516	Federally listed species in the area include grizzly bear and Canada lynx. Wolverine is a candidate species. Proposed dam and reservoir site is within designated grizzly bear Core areas. The primary emphasis for these lands is to provide secure habitat for grizzly bears. Management activities are not to occur during the period bears are active (Targhee Revised Forest Plan 1997).	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
73	7-40	520	Big Springs to Coffee Pot Campground and Moose Creek from its source to the junction with the Henrys Fork are both designated as Eligible Recreation Rivers including the Henrys Lake outlet from the Forest Boundary to junction with Big Springs outflow. Major water resource projects are not authorized within these eligible sections. (1997 Revised Forest Plan TNF).	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
74	7-40	520	The outstanding remarkable characteristics identified were fish, wildlife, and recreational opportunities.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
75	7-40	520	The Henrys Fork from Big Springs to Island Park Reservoir is designated as a state recreational river (1992 Comprehensive State Water Plan for the Henrys Fork Basin).	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
76	7-40	535	Based on current State and Federal designations Big Springs is not an acceptable diversion location nor are any of the other proposed diversion sites associated with the Moose Creek Dam.	2	See response to comment 56. The referenced statement is an assumption for the purposes of the evaluation.
77	7-40	535	Pursuant to Idaho Code 42-1734A(6) the following activities are prohibited: construction or expansion of dams or impoundments, Construction of hydropower projects and . . . ; New diversion works shall be limited . . . not to exceed 0.5 cubic feet per second (1992 Comprehensive State Water Plan for the Henrys Fork Basin).	2	See response to comment 56.
78	1-1		All alternatives include source water that is recognized as valuable to YCT persistence. The exception to this observation is Moose Creek. Source waters and impacts to them need to be incorporated in this analysis.	2	In the alternative-specific sections, potential impacts to YCT populations are noted for each source water. A more detailed environmental assessment will be conducted during future phases of the study.
79	2-4	64	Potentially available water does not include environmental needs such as a natural hydrograph which has been shown to be beneficial to YCT. Further, initial calculations include capturing all spring runoff, which again has been shown to negatively affect cutthroat trout.	2	See response to comments 7 and 78.
80	Exhibit 2-2		Visual concept of capturing spring runoff. Depicts hydrograph that is typically associated with rainbow trout fishery, and detrimental to cutthroat trout that evolved under that natural hydrograph.	2	See response to comment 79. Also, there will be an opportunity to provide additional input regarding runoff capture and the resulting hydrograph during future phases of the study.
81	2-8	156	Report considers impacts to Fish and Wildlife corridors in the cost analysis, but the document does not consider fish and wildlife later when discussing impacts. We believe that many of these options will impact fish and wildlife, and this needs to be incorporated throughout the document.	2	Impacts to fish and wildlife corridors are an element that was excluded from the cost estimate, and fish and wildlife are listed in the impacts tables for each alternative (e.g., 3-10, 3-11, and 3-12). At this time, the fish and wildlife impacts analysis focused on presence/absence of identified species. A more detailed environmental assessment will be conducted during future phases of the study.
82	2-9	193	The storage plan for filling these reservoirs would not be consistent with YCT management. YCT do well under a natural hydrograph that includes a spring peak. Altering this flow to a more regulated, constant flow would likely be detrimental to YCT populations.	2	See response to comment 80.
83	2-13	300	The document references issuing new water rights that could be met by the new storage alternatives. The premise of this document is that we need more water to meet existing rights. Issuing new rights is inconsistent with the expressed needs for this project and brings into question the actual demonstrated need we have for increased storage.	2	See response to comment 21.

Comments Received on the New Surface Storage TM and Responses

#	Page	Line	Comment	Comment Category ^a	Response (if necessary)
84	2-15	393	Key Assumptions – environmental data not adequately analyzed or accounted for. Impacts from flows, water source for filling and impacts of diversions are missing and need to be incorporated.	2	See responses to comments 78 and 81.
85	3-1	23	More explanation is needed to describe how Lane Lake can improve the Egin Bench irrigated region, located upstream of the intended reservoir.	1	Water released from Lane Lake would provide more water to the Teton River during critical high demand periods, decreasing the amount of water that would need to be diverted from the Henrys Fork River to the Teton River via the Crosscut Canal. Therefore, more Henrys Fork water would be available for the Egin Bench irrigated region. Section 3.2 is only a summary, so no revision is needed there, but a short explanation was added to Section 5.5.
86	3-2	Exhibit 3-1	<p>Table states that part or all of this quantity would be available later for out-of-basin needs. This suggests little to no water would be needed for in-basin needs, again calling into question the need for additional storage. More explanation on how the needs coincide with this project are needed. This applies to the same table outlined in each of the alternatives.</p> <p>Also, changes in connectivity should incorporate the potential to disrupt connectivity in the Fall River and resulting impacts to the trout population in the Henrys Fork that likely use the Fall River for spawning and rearing.</p> <p>Additionally, hydropower interests at Chester could be affected by this proposal, and should be addressed.</p>	2	<p>See response to comment 26.</p> <p>Following the runoff capture approach described in Section 2.2.1.3, Fall River connectivity would not be disrupted.</p> <p>See responses to comments 3 and 14.</p>
87	3-6	Exhibit 3-5	Footnote 3 states that Bitch Creek is not sufficient to fill Lane Lake, but that it is not economically feasible to construct the infrastructure to augment this flow. As such, it appears Bitch Creek by itself is not capable of filling Lane Lake. More clarity here would be helpful.	2	Bitch Creek is capable of nearly filling Lane Lake on an average year, and the cost to develop conveyance infrastructure from another supply source to make up for that small deficit was not considered economically viable.
88	3-9	107	Impacted river segments do not include the Henrys Fork (tied to Fall River), Snake River, waters below diversion points or the fish resources in the individual water sources such as Bitch Creek and other waters.	2	At this stage of the study, impacted river segments are consistent with those considered for special status designation, as defined in footnote A of Exhibit 3-10. A more detailed environmental assessment will be conducted during future phases of the study.
89	3-10	Exhibit 3-10	Table disregards any fish resources other than cutthroat trout. This is a serious flaw in the current analysis and needs to be addressed. This applies to all the alternatives.	1	At this stage of the study, only state fish species of concern are being highlighted in the analysis. YCT was identified and vetted through a series of Workgroup meetings. Per discussions with IDFG, the title of that category will be renamed and presence of rainbow trout will also be considered for the Henrys Fork watershed alternatives. Also, a more detailed environmental assessment will be conducted during future phases of the study.
90	3-11	128	Large game is referenced throughout the document – the correct term is Big Game. Minor point...	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
91	3-15	Exhibit 3-13	Environmental considerations considered neutral. Given comments above, I would suggest re-classifying as negative.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
92	4-21	236	Dam configuration includes diverting water from Bitch Creek all the way to Spring Creek Dam. Analysis needs to incorporate impacts to the Teton River through the Teton Canyon from doing so, as well as impacts to Bitch Creek.	2	Since no additional water would be withdrawn from the Teton River (only Bitch Creek water that entered the Teton River upstream), and since the diversion would contain a fish screen, impacts to this stretch of the Teton River are assumed to be minimal.
93	4-24	282	The section on impacted river segments needs to be expanded to include impacts to source water supplies including effects below diversion points and effects from cross-drainage diversions. This applies to all alternatives.	2	See response to comment 88.
94	4-26	295	Flow alterations could affect fisheries in the Teton River as well as the specified source water supply reaches. Water diverted out of Bitch Creek is water that is no longer in the Teton River and will have impacts as such.	2	See responses to comments 81 and 88.

Comments Received on the New Surface Storage TM and Responses

#	Page	Line	Comment	Comment Category ^a	Response (if necessary)
95	6-23	296	The report specifies that flow releases would likely occur during the summer and fall, yet hydropower generation is a component of all of these proposals. It is unlikely that hydropower would be feasible if it only generated during a few months of the year. As such, these statements are not consistent. More clarity on the anticipated flow releases will help ascertain the environmental impacts from these projects.	2	Refined flow release strategies have not been established at this stage of the study. Releases would be executed in order to meet demands (agricultural and environmental), with hydropower as a potential component of each project if economically viable.
96	7-29	390	Moose Creek is identified as being filled by excess peak flows, yet is generally classified as a spring system. As such, there are not any excess flows to capture. This should be clarified. The key findings also state that no YCT would be impacted, but fails to mention the incredibly important rainbow trout fishery that could be impacted. This needs to be addressed.	2	Only minimal excess peak flows from Moose Creek would be available for capture (Exhibit 7-3). It was assumed that the remainder of the reservoir volume would be provided by the Henrys Fork River. Since the hydrologic evaluation approach is not necessarily valid for a regulated system like the Henrys Fork, it was assumed that sufficient water would be available. A more detailed examination of hydrology will be conducted during future phases of the study.
				1	See response to comment 89. Comment addressed in final TM.
97	7-38	507	Report states no YCT populations have been found in the Henrys Fork, which is not accurate. Wild cutthroat trout are found in the Henrys Lake area and tributaries, and it is common for cutthroat to move from these areas to their native habitat in the upper Henrys Fork. Population surveys have documented cutthroat in the Henrys Fork, although not in large abundance. Further, active stocking programs are in place for cutthroat in the Henrys Fork including the upper river.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
98	7-39	Exhibit 7-11	Connectivity issues need to include Big Springs and its connection to the Henrys Fork. Cutthroat need to be added as present in the Henrys Fork and Big Springs.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
99	7-40	512	Text excludes Grizzly bears and Lynx, two important species when discussing environmental impacts. Big Springs also enjoys special designation – this should be clarified.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
100	7-41	Exhibit 7-12	Table needs to include big game winter range and migration corridors for moose; T/E species need to include grizzly bear and lynx	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
101	1-1	37-40	When you mention “the springs” are you referring to Big Springs? If so that is how it should be mentioned.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
102	1-2	41	In needs assessment it states no new hydropower facilities are allowed on the Henrys Fork above Ashton. Please verify if this is just on the Henrys Fork on in the basin	2	See response to comments 3 and 56.
103	1-3	Exhibit 1-1	Consider putting the major irrigated regions on the map	2	Adding irrigation regions may clutter the map and detract from the main overview intent. Irrigated regions are delineated in the Henrys Fork Watershed Basin Study Needs Assessment (http://www.usbr.gov/pn/programs/studies/idaho/henrysfork/techrept/index.html).
104	2-8	152-166	Consider a bullet that identifies the cost involved for environmental analysis due to NEPA on all public lands or federally connected projects	2	NEPA and other permitting costs are assumed to be covered under the non-field costs described in Section 2.3.5.
105	2-9	169	Overwintering reservoir that are drawn down do not provide good overwintering habitat unless they are managed that way. This should be omitted	1	Comment addressed in final TM.

Comments Received on the New Surface Storage TM and Responses

#	Page	Line	Comment	Comment Category ^a	Response (if necessary)
106	2-14	336-339	Other criteria for determining a water right should also be listed. The director of the department of water resources shall find and determine from the evidence presented to what use or uses the water sought to be appropriated can be and are intended to be applied. In all applications whether protested or not protested, where the proposed use is such: (a) that it will reduce the quantity of water under existing water rights, or (b) that the water supply itself is insufficient for the purpose for which it is sought to be appropriated, or (c) where it appears to the satisfaction of the director that such application is not made in good faith, is made for delay or speculative purposes, or (d) that the applicant has not sufficient financial resources with which to complete the work involved therein, or (e) that it will conflict with the local public interest as defined in section 42-202B , Idaho Code, or (f) that it is contrary to conservation of water resources within the state of Idaho, or (g) that it will adversely affect the local economy of the watershed or local area within which the source of water for the proposed use originates, in the case where the place of use is outside of the watershed or local area where the source of water originates; the director of the department of water resources may reject such application and refuse issuance of a permit therefor, or may partially approve and grant a permit for a smaller quantity of water than applied for, or may grant a permit upon conditions.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
107	2-14	354-362	It may be beneficial to list all the minimum stream flows in the upper basin, perhaps in a table or on a map.	2	Our current hydrologic analysis approach does not consider water rights. A more detailed examination of hydrology will be conducted during future phases of the study and is expected to evaluate minimum stream flows.
108	2-15	369	Water quality certification is granted from the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality not Health and welfare	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
109	3-1	28	There needs to be an explanation how Lane Lake would actually help unmet irrigation in the North Freemont irrigated regions-what is your working hypothesis here?	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
110	3-1	29	It says Lane Lake releases would help lower teton river. Not correct it could help North fork teton river an south fork teton river.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
111	3-3	Exhibit 3-2	Nice to show irrigated regions on map	2	See response to comment 103.
112	3-9	96	Mentions that Lane Lake would help North Fremont irrigation region-how would this happen? Should provide a further explanation or omit.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
113	3-10	Exhibit 3-10	Conant creek is a state natural and recreational river and should be identified as so.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
114	3-11	117	Lower Teton River should be changed to North Fork Teton River	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
115	3-12	3-11	There is probably more Species of Greatest Conservation need. This needs to be run through an IDFG database requested at the following website. Recommend you use a 5 mile buffer around the site. https://fishandgame.idaho.gov/ifwis/portal/form/obtain-information	2	The IDFG database (February 2011) was used to identify the species listed based on a 1 mile buffer area around the proposed reservoir site. Also, a more detailed environmental assessment will be conducted during future phases of the study.
116	3-15	Exhibit 3-13	Do not agree that environmental considerations are considered neutral if water is diverted from Bitch Creek. This would be negative for YCT and needs to be identified. Especially if diverted from the middle section of the Bitch Creek system. The proposed location of diverting Bitch Creek is on a State Protected Natural River reach and diversions are not allowed.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.

Comments Received on the New Surface Storage TM and Responses

#	Page	Line	Comment	Comment Category ^a	Response (if necessary)
117	4-16	206	How would a reservoir on Spring Creek provide additional storage for the Teton Basin- you need to explain on a factual basis.	1	Comment addressed in final TM (changing basin to watershed). See response to comment 34.
118	4-27	Exhibit 4-11	There is probably more Species of Greatest Conservation need. This needs to be run through an IDFG database requested at the following website. Recommend you use a 5 mile buffer around the site. https://fishandgame.idaho.gov/ifwis/portal/form/obtain-information	2	See response to comment 115.
119	4-29	Exhibit 4-13	Do not agree that environmental considerations are considered neutral if water is diverted from Bitch Creek. This would be negative for YCT and needs to be identified. Especially if diverted from the middle section of the Bitch Creek system. The proposed location of diverting Bitch Creek is on a State Protected Natural River reach and diversions are not allowed.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
120	5-1	35	Lower Teton River would not benefit by releases from Moody. Needs to be omitted	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
121	5-9	124	Lower Teton River would not benefit by releases from Moody. Needs to be omitted	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
122	5-11	Exhibit 5-11	There is probably more Species of Greatest Conservation need. This needs to be run through an IDFG database requested at the following website. Recommend you use a 5 mile buffer around the site. https://fishandgame.idaho.gov/ifwis/portal/form/obtain-information	2	See response to comment 115.
123	6-15	214	How would the reservoir help unmet irrigation demand in Teton Valley	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
124	6-15	216	How would releases in Badger Creek Reservoir help upper badger creek	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
125	6-15	216	North fork Teton River should be identified	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
126	6-16	Exhibit 6-1	Omit upper Badger Creek and and include North Fork Teton River change this throughout section 6.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
127	6-23	Exhibit 6-10	Badger Creek is recognized as a state protected recreational river and needs to be reflected in the table	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
128	6-24	Exhibit 6-11	There is probably more Species of Greatest Conservation need. This needs to be run through an IDFG database requested at the following website. Recommend you use a 5 mile buffer around the site. https://fishandgame.idaho.gov/ifwis/portal/form/obtain-information	2	See response to comment 115.
129	6-28	Exhibit 6-13	Do not agree that environmental considerations are considered neutral if this project is going to impact Yellowstone Cutthroat trout in the Badger Creek system. Should receive a negative.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
130	7-29	367	If you are referring to Big Springs-call it that	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
131	7-29	370	It was stated in the needs assessment that no new hydro is allowed on Henrys fork- please clarify	2	See response to comment 102.
132	7-29	396	How would Moose Creek benefit anything on the Teton system????	2	Expansion of the Crosscut Canal would allow cross-basin transfer of additional water released from Moose Creek to be sent from the Henrys Fork River to the Teton River.
133	7-39	Exhibit 7-39	Henrys Fork should be identified as a state protected River (both recreation and natural	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
134	7-40	515-516	There is presence of grizzly bear and lynx-double check with USFWS and Forest	1	Comment addressed in final TM.

Comments Received on the New Surface Storage TM and Responses

#	Page	Line	Comment	Comment Category ^a	Response (if necessary)
135	7-42	Exhibit 7-12	There is probably more Species of Greatest Conservation need. This needs to be run through an IDFG database requested at the following website. Recommend you use a 5 mile buffer around the site. https://fishandgame.idaho.gov/ifwis/portal/form/obtain-information	2	See response to comment 115.
136	Exhibit 2-1		Reporting flow estimates with 5 significant digits based upon StreamStats does not reflect the quality of the estimates.	2	Comment acknowledged, but no change required (minor volume adjustments would have minor impacts on conveyance features, associated costs, and impacts).
137	2-4	78	Attachment A does not exist	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
138	Exhibit 2-1		Using this method of estimating water available to store probably over estimates availability. Existing water rights will normally take more than the average base flows leaving less water available to store under a new water right.	2	See response to comment 7.
139	2-8	133	Hydropower potential needs to be broken into at least 2 categories, those using only the dam height and those having additional head available. Current method disadvantages those with additional head.	2	See response to comment 3.
140	2-8	161	Not sure what this means if it means anything.	2	Refers to potential costs associated with acquiring rights from the State or existing water rights holders. May be minimal, but will be investigated further during future phases of the study.
141	2-12	283	Pumping costs appear to vary widely among the alternatives. How will it be possible to make meaningful comparisons among the alternatives without some consideration for O&M for pumping?	2	Comment acknowledged, but no change required (cost is not the sole screening criteria at this level of study, and O&M costs will be including during future phases).
142	3-1	28	Need explanation of how this alternative helps North Fremont area.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
143	3-9	96	Same.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.
144	4-23	259	Spillway in Exhibit 4-7 does not match Exhibit 4-6.	1	Comment addressed in final TM.